REMARKS

This Response responds to the Office Action dated May 1, 2007 in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 1 and 2 claim an information processing method in which processing data and electronic money are attached together and received through a network. Claim 3 claims an electronic payment method in which data to be information processed is attached together with electronic money and simultaneously received through a network. Claim 4 claims a system for making payment by electronic money and includes a user side subsystem which transmits processing request data and electronic money data attached together through a network. Claim 5 claims an electronic money processor in which a receiving member receives processing request data and electronic money which are attached together. Claim 8 claims an image forming apparatus comprising a receiving member which receives print data and electronic money data attached together through a network. Thus, the claimed invention as claimed in claims 1-5 and 8 provides a system and method in which printing is prevented when payment cannot be made while a wait time for payment and print processing can be reduced. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1-5 and 8.

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Aiyama* (U.S. Patent No. 7,0175,666) in view of *Olsen et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,952,780).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103. The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for

reasons which will be set forth below, applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

Aiyama appears to disclose at column 3, lines 52-61, an image forming apparatus 1 including a network interface 2, printer 5, image memory 4, CPU 3, an internal bus, a network 11, a history management unit 7 and a host computer 6. Thus, nothing in *Aiyama* shows, teaches or suggests receiving processing data and electronic money, attached together, through a network as claimed in claims 1-3, 5 and 8. Rather, Figure 1 of *Aiyama* only discloses the contents of the image forming apparatus 1 connected to a host computer 6 and history management unit 7 via a network 11.

Additionally, *Aiyama* merely discloses at column 6, lines 10-39, an operation panel 12 for allowing a user to input an address number, a document number and a credit-card number. Nothing in *Aiyama* shows, teaches or suggests that the processing data and the electronic money, which are attached together, are <u>received</u> through a network as claimed in claims 1-3, 5 and 8. Rather, *Aiyama* only discloses that a user inputs an address number, a document number and a credit-card number through an operation panel 12 on the image forming apparatus 1.

Also, *Aiyama* discloses at column 6, lines 50-60, that the document number that the user inputs is input to the document server 8 via the network and the document server 8 then inputs the document to the image forming apparatus 1 based upon the address of the document number. Thus, neither the document server 8 nor the image forming apparatus 1 of *Aiyama* receives both processing data and electronic money attached together through the network, as claimed in claims 1-3, 5 and 8. Rather, *Aiyama* clearly teaches away from the claimed invention since

the document number itself is input to the document server 8 while the document server 8 outputs the document to the image forming apparatus 1.

Furthermore, column 6, lines 61-67, of *Aiyama* merely discloses inputting a credit card number to an operation panel 12 and transmitting the same to a charge collector 9. Thus, nothing in *Aiyama* shows, teaches or suggests attaching the processing data and the electronic money together and receiving them through a network as claimed in claims 1-3, 5 and 8. Rather, *Aiyama* clearly teaches that only the credit card number is transmitted to the charge collector 9.

Similarly, since *Aiyama* only discloses transmitting a document number to a document server 8 and returning of the document data to the image processor 1 and separately transmitting a credit card number to a charge collector 9, nothing in *Aiyama* shows, teaches or suggests a user side subsystem of transmitting both processing request data and electronic money data, which are attached together, to a processor side subsystem. Rather, *Aiyama* clearly discloses that only the document number is transmitted to the document server 8 while only the credit card number is transmitted to the charge collector 9. Hence, nothing in *Aiyama* shows, teaches or suggests transmitting both processing request data and electronic money data attached together or transmitting both data to a processor side subsystem as claimed in claim 4.

Also, *Aiyama* only discloses that the charge collector 9 receives the credit card number. Nothing in *Aiyama* shows, teaches or suggests an electronic money processor having a receiving member which receives both processing request data and electronic money attached together as claimed in claim 5. Rather, *Aiyama* only discloses that the charge collector 9 receives the credit card number.

Finally, *Aiyama* only discloses an image processor 1 which outputs the credit card number to a charge collector 9 and outputs a document number to a document server 8 and receives in return the document. Nothing in *Aiyama* shows, teaches or suggests an image forming apparatus having a receiving member which receives print data and electronic money data attached together as claimed in claim 8. Rather, *Aiyama* only discloses that the image forming apparatus 1 receives print data from document server 8 and receives either a print permission or a print refusal from the charge collector 9 (column 7, lines 3-5).

Olsen et al appears to disclose at column 25, lines 33-42, having users categorize jobs and afterwards the categorized jobs are used to calculate prices. Nothing in *Olsen et al* shows, teaches or suggests processing data and electronic money are attached together as claimed in claims 1-5 and 8. Rather, *Olsen et al* only discloses having a user categorize jobs at submission time and using the information afterwards to calculate prices.

Furthermore, column 59, lines 37-50 of *Olsen et al* merely discloses tagging a print job with a client ID or a project number. Nothing in *Olsen et al* shows, teaches or suggests attaching together processing data and electronic money as claimed in claims 1-5 and 8. Rather, the print job is only associated with a client number or project number.

Finally, *Olsen et al* merely discloses at column 5, lines 23-37 a card reader which reads information from a card and communicates the information to a server. Nothing in *Olsen et al* shows, teaches or suggests electronic money and processing data are attached together and received through a network as claimed in claims 1-5

and 8. Rather, *Olsen et al* only discloses a card reader receiving card information and communicating the same to a server.

A combination of *Aiyama* and *Olsen et al* would merely suggest to replace the operation panel 12 of *Aiyama* with the card reader of *Olsen et al*. Thus, nothing in the combination of the references shows, teaches or suggests the primary features as claimed in claims 1-5 and 8 as discussed above. Therefore, applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1-5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 6-7 and 9-14 recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-7 and 9-14 would not have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §103 over *Aiyama* and *Olsen et al* at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 6-7 and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: <u>July 13, 2007</u>   By: _____

James A. LaBarre
Registration No. 28632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620

#1174703-v1